

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10/715,324 11/17/2003 Peter John Hunt 1171/41475/56B/106/107 5106 279 7590 08/08/2005 EXAMINER TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI, PAIK, SANG YEOP BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD. 105 WEST ADAMS STREET ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **SUITE 3600** 3742 CHICAGO, IL 60603

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				تسنن
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/715,324	HUNT ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	·	Sang Y. Paik	3742	
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence addre	ISS
THE - Extended after aft	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory periou ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mained patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repl eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (? Id will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH ute, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this comm IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
Status				
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19	May 2005.		
2a)□		nis action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matter	s, prosecution as to the m	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	tion of Claims			
	☐ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.			
Applicat	tion Papers	•		
_	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.				
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	***		1.121(d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-	152.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a limit	nts have been received. nts have been received in App ionty documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Sta	age
A44.				
Attachmer 1) Notice	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) Interview Sum	nmary (PTO-413)	1
2)	ce of References Cited (FTO-632) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/N	/lail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-15	i2)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 10/715,324 Page 2

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 10 and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend on another multiple dependent claim.

See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 10 and 11 have not been further treated on the merits.

2. Claims 15 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 15, on line 24, the period (.) should be deleted; and in claim 19, on lines 7 and 8, "or" should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 19, there is no proper antecedent basis for "said indication of the external temperature".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3742

6 Claims 1, 2, 16, 17, 18, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Daniell et al (US 5,558,084).

Daniell shows the breathing assistance apparatus having an electrical input power to activate a heater capable of humidifying the gas at the desired level, and a controller (11, 16) to determine the parameter such as the temperature of the humidified gas which relates to the flow rate of the gas. The heater includes the conduit heater (10) and the water heater (20), and Daniell further shows an ambient external temperature sensor (45), a humidification chamber (3) having the water heater (20) and a water heater sensor/chamber sensor (8) to monitor the parameter such as the temperature of the water heater, the controller which monitors or regulates the desired heating temperature with the input of the external temperature indicated by the external temperature sensor, a connector means (66) which enable to correctly connect the conduit heater to the controller, and an indicator (67, 62) which indicates proper functions of the apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 3-7, 13, 14, 19-23 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell (US 5,558,084).

Daniell shows the apparatus and method claimed except explicitly showing the controller to continuously monitor the claimed parameter and to follow the claimed steps.

Art Unit: 3742

Daniell teaches that the heating elements are controlled in response to the temperature sensors that measure the temperature of the water heater as well as the conduit heater and the ambient temperature. As the temperature falls or arises due to the surrounding conditions, the heaters are further controlled to be turned off or on.

While the Daniel does not shows explicitly show the sequence of the claimed steps, it would have been obvious to provide the controller with such monitoring processes or steps to monitor the changes in the threshold parameter values, including the changes in the temperatures, flow rate, or any other related parameters, so that the power to the water heater as well as the conduit heater can be continuously adjusted to maintain the desired humidity or gas temperature as the they are susceptible to the surrounding elements to affect its efficiency to meet the desired humidified gas.

8. Claims 8, 9, 12, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell et al (US 5,558,084) in view of McComb (US 5,349,946) or Clementi (US 5,031,612).

Daniell shows the apparatus and method claimed except the gas supply means to supply gas to the humidifier.

McComb shows a gas supply with a flow meter/sensor to supply gas and the processor to determine the desired humidity level at the given flow rate. Clementi also shows a gas supply such as a blower to provide the pressured gas flow to provide the desired humidified gas. In view of McComb or Clementi, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Daniell with the gas supply means to provide the air source that is humidified for the user and to control the rate at which the air/gas is provided.

Art Unit: 3742

9. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell in view of McComb or Clementi as applied to claims 8, 9, 12, 24 and 25 above, and further in view of Rapoport et al (US 5,546,933).

Daniell in view of McComb or Clementi, shows the apparatus and method claimed except the gas supply having a fan with the variable speed electric motor.

Rapoport shows a blower having a variable speed blower motor to supply air. In view of Rapoport, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Daniell, as modified by McComb or Clementi, with the variable speed motor fan to control the amount of gas and the rate at which the gas is supplied.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 15 would be allowed when the informality objected under the claim objection is corrected.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 5/19/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues Daniell does not show a parameter relating to the flow rate of gases, and further argues that the temperature of the gas is not a parameter related to the gas flow. This argument is not deemed persuasive since it is well known that the higher the temperature, faster the gas flow would occur. This notion is also supported in the applicant's own remark on page 19, on line 19, that "[t]he greater the amount of power required to raise the gases to a given temperature, the greater the flow rate of gases through the humidifier."

Art Unit: 3742

monitored.

The applicant argues that Daniell does not disclose the step of continuously monitoring the parameter for changes and controlling the power, and that the Examiner has not provided any support for the obviousness of such step and rather used the hindsight in the rejection. This argument is not deemed persuasive. As stated in the grounds for rejection, the examiner states that while Daniell does not explicitly disclose such steps, Daniell shows the evidence of the continuous monitoring with the example of the heaters being controlled in response to the rise and fall of the related temperatures.

This can be done when the parameters including the temperatures are continuously

The applicant also argues that Daniell does not shows the indicator which shows when the conduit heater is correctly connected. Daniell clearly shows the switch 66 which would connect the conduit heater and the controller. Daniell shows the indicators as the elements 67 and 62 wherein 67 shows the steps the software program that is executed by the processor, and since the connection of switch 66 is executed by the processor, such step would be displayed and furthermore the element 62 which is an audio alarm would be activated when undesirable circumstances or faults occur. This clearly supports the claimed indicator as well as the claimed connector.

The applicant argues that McComb or Clementi does not disclose using a measured of the rate of flow of gas through the apparatus to control the power to the humidifier. It is noted that McComb and Clementi are applied to supplement Daniell, and the combination of such prior art would teach the disclosed use of the measured rate of flow of gas through the apparatus to control the power to the humidifier.

Art Unit: 3742

Claim 29 was mistakenly left out in the rejection in the last office action but is

now included.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sang Y. Paik whose telephone number is 571-272-4783.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-4:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on 571-272-4777. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.P.

Sang Y Paik Primary Examiner Page 7

Art Unit 3742

syp